

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed on July 22, 2008. Claims 1-14 were pending in the present Application. Claim 3 has been amended, claims 1, 2, and 4-14 have been canceled, new claims 15-23 have been added, leaving pending in the Application claims 3, and 15-23. No new matter has been added.

35 USC § 101 Rejection of Claim 1

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 USC § 101, as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matters. Claims 1-3 and 4-14 have been replaced in response to the Section 103 rejection by claims 15-23. Accordingly, the Section 101 rejection of claim 1 is moot. The appended claims are believed to conform to the requirements of Section 101.

35 USC § 112 Rejection of Claims 6, 7, 13, and 14

Claims 6, 7, 13, and 14 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-3 and 4-14 have been replaced in response to the Section 103 rejection by claims 15-23. Accordingly, the Section 112 rejection of claims 6, 7, 13, and 14 is moot. The appended claims are believed to conform to the requirements of Section 112.

35 USC § 103 Rejection of Claims 1-14

Claims 1-4, 6, 8-11, and 13 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Combs et al., (U.S. Patent No. 7,058,508 B2, hereinafter “Combs”), in view of Fujimoto et al., (Japan Patent No. JP 2001195372 A, hereinafter “Fujimoto”).

Claims 5, 7, 12, and 14 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Combs, in view of Fujimoto, and further in view of Sameshima et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,983,306 B1, hereinafter “Sameshima”).

Claims 1-3 and 4-14 have been replaced in response to the Section 103 rejection by claims 15-23. Accordingly, the Section 103 rejections of claims 1-3 and 4-14 are moot. The appended claims are believed to be patentable over the art of record for the reasons set forth below.

New Claim 15

New independent claim 15 has been added to cover various embodiment of the present invention. Applicants submit that support for claim 15 may be found in the Specification as filed.

Claim 15 recites:

A distributed system in which a plurality of devices are coupled to each other through a network, comprising:
a storage unit;
a processing unit; and
a communication unit;
wherein the storage unit is configured to store a service scenario and a context, wherein the service scenario describes functions necessary to provide a service and relationships between the functions, and the context serves as a criterion for selecting one or more devices to be used in providing the service,
wherein the processing unit comprises:
an extraction unit being configured to extract the devices necessary for performing the service based on the service scenario;
a detection unit being configured to detect available devices located at a site wherein the service can be provided in response to a request from a user according to the context;
a creation unit being configured to create correspondence information on linkage between the detected devices, the correspondence information including function information, device information, process information, and data destination information; and
a service execution unit being configured to execute the request by linking the detected devices based on the correspondence information;
wherein:
in response to a context change while the request is being executed, the detection unit redetects available devices according to the changed context, the creation unit rewrites correspondence information on linkage between the redetected devices, and the service execution unit allocates data destination with reference to the correspondence information while transmitting data. (underlining added for emphasis)

Applicants respectfully submit that the features of claim 15 are not rendered obvious by Combs and Fujimoto, combined individually or in combination. For example, Combs and Fujimoto, separately and in combination, fail to teach or suggest “in response to a context change while the request is being executed, the detection unit redetects available devices according to the changed context, the creation unit rewrites correspondence information on linkage between the redetected devices, and the service execution unit allocates data destination with reference to the correspondence information while transmitting data” as recited in claim 15.

The present Application is directed to a distributed system which is configured to provide services requested by various users. The services are provided by selecting and linking devices according to a service scenario (i.e. functions necessary for a service and a way of relating the functions) and a context (i.e. pieces of information, such as a situation of a user, a situation in an environment, etc.). (Specification: Summary of the Invention). The problems to be solved by this invention are: (1) providing continuous services to users without interruptions even the context may change, and (2) enabling extraction of the devices used for providing the services by querying a database or through mutual communication between the devices.

Combs is direct to “a method and system for automated building service brokering.” (Combs: col. 2, lines 65-66). Fujimoto provides a method for “realizing a function for making a user able to enjoy information contents generated by exchange between agents matched with a utilizing location, a utilizing environment and a utilizing terminal, etc.” (Fujimoto: Abstract). Nowhere does Combs or Fujimoto teach or even suggest a system to provide continuous service in response to a context change while a request is being executed. On the contrary, the current Application is capable of providing continuous service to a user regardless context changes by redetecting available devices and rewriting correspondence information on linkage between the redetected devices. Accordingly, neither Combs nor Fujimoto teaches or suggest “in response to a context change while the request is being executed, the detection unit redetects available devices according to the changed context, the creation unit rewrites correspondence information on linkage between the redetected devices, and the service execution unit allocates data destination with reference to the correspondence information while transmitting data” as recited in claim 15.

For at least the foregoing reasons, even if Combs and Fujimoto were combined (although there appears to be no rationale for combining), the resultant combination would not render claim 15 obvious. Accordingly, claim 15 is believed to be allowable.

New Claim 19

New independent claim 19 recites features that are substantially similar to independent claim 15, and are thus believed to be allowable over Combs and Fujimoto for at least a similar rationale as discussed for claim 15.

New Claim 16-18 and 20-23

Claims 16-18 and 20-23 depend from independent claims 15 and 19 respectively, and are thus believed to be allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed for claim 15 and 19.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,

/George B. F. Yee/

George B. F. Yee
Reg. No. 37,478

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400
Fax: 415-576-0300
GBFY:JOS:lsb
61707399 v1